DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 204 273 SP 018 072

AUTHOR Stein, Sandra L.
TITLE Faculty Expectations of Doctoral and Career Mentors.
PUB DATE Mar 81
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association (Philadelphia, PA, March, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Counseling; *College Faculty; Colleges; *Doctoral Programs; Employment Opportunities; Graduate School Faculty; Higher Education; *Interprofessional Relationship; *Mentors; *Teacher Attitudes; Universities

ABSTRACT

School of education faculty members from one college and one university were asked to express their ideas on what should be expected of an individual who acts as a doctoral or career mentor. It was also the purpose of the study to determine whether differences in expectations existed based on institutional type (college vs. university) and whether respondents had had a mentor. The sampled faculty expected doctoral mentors to assist proteges with their dissertation research, include proteges on their research teams, assist them in finding their first jobs, and educate them in the "rules of the game" of their profession. Overall expectations of career mentors were that they should provide moral support, assistance in finding subsequent jobs and assistance in research and publishing, and educate their proteges in the "rules of the game" of their profession. Very little difference was found between the opinions of college and university faculty. While faculty expectations of doctoral mentors were not appreciably affected by whether or not the respondent had had a doctoral mentor, expectations of career mentors were affected by whether the respondent had had a career mentor. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sandra L. Stein

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED204273

Faculty Expectations of Doctoral and Career Mentors

Sandra L. Stein

Rider College

Paper presented at the

Eastern Educational Research Association

Philadelphia, Pa., March, 1981.

SP018072

Faculty Expectations of Doctoral and Career Mentors

The importance of mentorships for career success in academia has been proclaimed by individuals and supported by research (Cameron, Note 1; Kundsin, 1974; Turinson et. al., 1978; Long, 1978; Reskin, 1979). Its continuing importance has been predicted by Gordon and Newmann (1979). Though the importance of mentors has been extensively documented, the expectations of mentors have not. In the only known study Dowdall and Boneparth (Note 2) studied the perceptions of proteges while they were in an institutionalized program to promote the advancement of women and minority faculty members in academic administration. In general they found that proteges wanted mentors with expertise, congenial style, strength of character and who offer them support. Most perceived their mentor as believing in them and giving them visibility.

The importance of type of institution on career success has been found by both Cameron (1978) and Long (1978). If being employed by a university as opposed to a college differentially affects career success, then it may influence expectations of mentors as well. It seems reasonable to suggest that type of institution (university vs. college) may be a relevant variable.

In Dowdall and Boneparth's study all the respondents at that time were proteges in a mentor-protege relationship. Since mentors have a strong effect on career success (Long, 1978; Reskin, 1979), they probably also strongly affect one's expectations of a mentor. Thus those who have not experienced mentors

may have different ideas about the role of a mentor. Further, in order to achieve more clarity in the use of the term mentor, a distinction was made between someone who served as a mentor during one's doctoral years and someone who served as a mentor early in one's career.

The purpose of this study was to determine what the expectations were and whether differences in expectations existed based on institutional type (university vs. college) or whether one had had a mentor.

Method

The literature on mentors was searched and 27 expectations were formulated. A questionnaire consisting of these 27 expectations expressed in phrase form was constructed for this study. For example, two of the expectations were: introduce you to leaders in your discipline and assist in planning job seeking strategies. Respondents checked whether this was an expectation for the doctoral and or the career mentor. The questionnaire was distributed to the sample through the campus mail of each person's institution. Follow-ups were conducted by mail one month later and by phone two months later.

In order to reduce the number of variables discussed and to measure each "expectation" by more than one item the responses to each set (doctoral mentor and career mentor) of 27 expectations were factor analyzed using principal factoring with iteration and oblique ratation. For each set, doctoral mentor and career mentor, eight factors were identified. In each set, one factor consisted of only one item, and one factor was uninterpretable.

This left six interpretable factors in each category. For both doctoral and career mentors two of these factors contain exactly the same items; the other four factors, though often similar in concept, do not contain exactly the same items for doctoral as for career mentors (Table 1).

These factors then were submitted to a Guttman scaling analysis to determine their scalability. The coefficients of reproducability and scalability were above the acceptable levels (Table 1). Therefore these factors were used to create six new variables (indeces) for each category, doctoral mentor and career mentor, using a simple additive procedure. Differences between institutional type and whether or not one had had a mentor were tested by twelve two-way (3 x 2) analyses of variance, one for each new variable.

Table 1. The coefficient of reproducability, coefficient of scalability, the numbers of the items on a particular factor and the total points per factor.

Name of factor	Coefficient of Reproducability	Coefficient of Scalability	Items Numbered	Total Possible Points
Doctoral Mentor				
Political Considerations	.9684	.8846	13-16	4
Friendship	.9677	.9211	26-27	2
Subsequent Job Seeking	.9734	.9167	22-25	4
First Job Seeking	.9574	.8222	19-20	2
Research Team	.9674	.9178	8-9	2
Dissertation Research	.9681	.778	10-11	2
Career Mentor				
Political Considerations	.9409	.8429	13-16	4
Friendship	.9451	.8718	26-27	2
Subsequent Job Seeking	.9780	.9339	23-25	3
First Job Seeking	.9385	.8205	17-21	4
Research and Publishing	.9000	.7483	8.9,13,16	4
Moral Support	.9457	.7297	2,7	2

Subjects

Two institutions were selected for inclusion in the study, a university and a college. Both have good reputations in their geographic region (the Northeast) and the university had been highly rated on the basis of contributions to the AERA annual programs (Schubert, 1979). Both institutions are publicly supported and offer graduate level programs; the university offers doctoral degrees and the college, master's degrees.

All full-time tenure track faculty members in the School of Education in these two institutions were included. Since the university had a separate graduate and undergraduate faculty, the sample was treated as three separate faculties. The total population of these faculties not counting administrators or those on leave of absence was 125, of which 96 returned usable questionnaires, an overall response rate of 76.8%. The response rate of each of these faculties was 88.5% (n=49; graduate faculty), 86.0% (n=23; undergraduate faculty) and 57.1% (n=24; college faculty).

Results

Overall Expectations

Table 2 reports the means and standard deviations for each of the six variables for each of the six variables for both doctoral mentors and career mentors. A higher score represents a higher expectation; conversely, a lower score

Table 2. Overall N's, mean's, S.D's and total possible points for doctoral and career mentors.

	Overall			Total possible points
Doctoral Mentor	N	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	
Poltical Considerations	95	2.91	1.51	4
Friendship	93	.82	.88	2
Subsequent Job Seeking	94	1.32	1.49	4
First Job Seeking	94	1.52	.77	2
Research Team	92	1.21	.93	2
Disseration Research	94	1.71	.56	2
Career Mentor				
Political Considerations	93	2.50	1.68	4
Friendship	91	.86	.91	2
Subsequent Job Seeking	91	2.09	1.43	3
First Job Seeking	91	1.71	1.88	4
Research-Publishing	90	2.41	1.56	4
Moral Support	92	1.60	.70	2

represents a lower expectation. In general it appears that for doctoral mentors mean expectations exceeded half the total possible points for four variables: Dissertation Research, Political Considerations, First Job Seeking, and Research Team. The means for the other two, Friendship and Subsequent Job Seeking, fell below half the total possible points. For career mentors, mean expectations exceeded half the total possible points for four variables: Political Considerations, Subsequent Job Seeking, Moral Support and Research & Publishing. Mean expectations for the other two variables, Friendship and First Job Seeking, fell below half the total possible points.

Doctoral Mentor

As can be seen in Table 3, the results of the two-way ANOVA's on the six doctoral level mentor factors indicated that whether or not one had had a doctoral mentor did not affect any of the six variables on expectations of doctoral mentors, but institutional differences did affect two of the variables. Subsequent analyses of Political Considerations and Research Team using a one-way ANOVA followed by Fishers Least Significant Difference (LSD) test indicated that graduate level university professors were more likely ($\bar{X}$=3.23, SD = 1.33) to expect the doctoral mentor to provide an orientation to political considerations for the protege than were the college faculty ($\bar{X}$=2.29, SD = 1.76). Subsequent analyses also indicated that graduate level university professors were more likely to expect the doctoral mentor to include the

protege on her/his research team (X=1.48, SD = .81) than were the college faculty (X=.74, SD = .96). There were no significant interactions.

Career Mentor

The results of the 2-way ANOVA's as seen in Table 4 indicate that two variables, Political Considerations and Research & Publishing, were significantly affected by either the type of institution and/or by whether or not one had had a career mentor. Subsequent analysis of institutional differences for Political Considerations using a one-way ANOVA and Fishers LSD test indicated that the University-Undergraduate faculty were more likely($\bar{X}$=3.09; SD = 1.51) to expect the career mentor to educate the protege with regard to political considerations that were the college faculty ($\bar{X}$=1.70; SD = 1.72). There was no difference between the University-Graduate faculty ($\bar{X}$=2.60; SD = 1.62) and either the University-Undergraduate faculty or the college faculty.

A t test for difference by whether or not one had had a career mentor for the variable Political Considerations indicated that those who had had a career mentor were more likely ($\bar{X}$=3.11; SD = 1.29) to expect a career mentor to educate the protege with regard to political considerations that those who had not had a career mentor ($\bar{X}$=2.20; SD = 1.79).

The t test for difference by whether or not one had had a career mentor for the variable Research & Publishing indicated that those who had had a career mentor were more likely ($\bar{X}$ = 2.00;

SD = 1.18) to expect a career mentor to assist a protege in research and publishing efforts than those who had not had a mentor ($\bar{X}$=2.16; SD = 1.66).

Discussion

Overall,the faculty sampled seemed to expect doctoral mentors to assist proteges with their dissertation research, include proteges on their research teams, assist them in finding their first jobs and educate them to the "rules of the game" in their profession. They were not as likely to expect a doctoral mentor to be a friend to the protege or to assist them in finding subsequent jobs. The overall expectations of career mentors were that they should provide moral support, assistance in finding subsequent jobs, education with regard to the "rules of the game", and assistance with research and publishing. Expectations for Friendship and providing assistance for finding the first job were lower.

Some of these expectations, however, were influenced by the type of institution in which the faculty were employed and by whether or not one had had either a doctoral or career mentor.

For example, faculty expectations of doctoral mentors on all six variables were not affected by whether or not one had had a doctoral mentor, whereas faculty expectations of career mentors were affected by whether or not one had had a career mentor on two of the six variables, Political Considerations and Research & Publishing. Perhaps the role of doctoral mentor is better known in academia, thus accounting for the lack of effect for having had

a doctoral mentor; conversely, perhaps the concept of career mentor is not as clearly distinguished in the minds of all colleges and university faculty.

Although the type of institution in which a faculty member was employed influenced expectations of both doctoral and career mentors on some variables, it did not for most variables. It is true that graduate level university faculty were more likely to expect doctoral mentors to educate the protege politically and to include the protege on the research team than college faculty. The fact that the graduate level faculty were the only ones actually in a position to be a doctoral mentor may have shaped their thinking. It is also true that undergraduate level university faculty were more likely to expect the career mentor to educate the protege politically, than were college faculty. However, it seems more noteworthy that only one-third or fewer of the variables were affected by either institutional types or whether or not one had had a doctoral or career mentor. While future research studies should be cautious with regard so these two variables, they do not seem to be major variables broadly affecting expectations of doctoral and career mentors.

Considering the different overall expectations for doctoral and career mentors, and the differential influence of institutional type and whether or not one had had a doctoral or career mentor, it seems that future research studies of mentoring in academia would be well advised to clarify which type of mentor is the focus of their study.

Table 3. Two-way ANOVA's on Doctoral Factors, Institution by Doctoral Mentor.

Scale	Institutions	Mentor	I x M	Residual
Political Considerations				
MS	9.48	1.35	4.65	2.06
df	2	1	2	81
F	4.59**	.65	2.25	
Friendship				
MS	.38	.15	1.80	.78
df	2	1	2	80
F	.49	.20	2.31	
Subsequent Job Seeking				
MS	1.91	3.70	.34	2.32
df	2	1	2	81
F	.83	1.60	.15	
First Job Seeking				
MS	1.10	1.08	.06	.62
df	2	1	2	80
F	1.77	1.74	.09	
Research Team				
MS	3.85	.05	.77	.82
df	2	1	2	80
F	4.69**	.06	.94	
Dissertation Research				
MS	.15	.09	.22	.34
df	2	1	2	80
F	.44	.26	.65	

** $p<.01$

Table 4. Two-way ANOVA's on Career Factors, Institution by Career Mentor.

Scale	Institution	Mentor	I X M	Residual
Political Considerations				
MS	13.32	11.07	2.39	2.50
df	2	1	2	77
F	5.33**	4.44**	.96	
Friendship				
MS	.56	.00	.08	.89
df	2	1	2	77
F	.63	.00	.09	
Subsequent Job Seeking				
MS	4.24	.24	2.95	1.90
df	2	1	2	78
F	2.23	.12	1.55	
First Job Seeking				
MS	3.92	2.41	.05	3.75
df	2	1	2	77
F	1.05	.64	.01	
Research Publishing				
MS	5.70	16.19	4.91	2.17
df	2	1	2	78
F	2.63	7.48**	2.27	
Moral Support				
MS	.45	.94	.04	.49
df	2	1	2	78
F	.92	1.92	.09	

* $p<.05$
** $p<.01$

Reference Notes

1. Cameron, S.M. Women in Academia: Faculty sponsorship, informal social structures and career success. Michigan: Michigan University, 1978. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. Ed 153 557).

2. Dowdall, J.A. & Boneparth, E. Mentors in Academia: The perceptions of proteges. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Sociological Association, Boston, August, 1979.

References

Gordon, G.A. & Neumann, Y. A three facet model of scientific development. Public Administration Review, 1979 39 (2), 134-140.

Kundsin, R.B. Women and Success: The Anatomy of Achievement. New York: William Morrow and Company, 1974.

Levinson, D.J., Darrow, C.N., Klein, E.B., Levinson, M.H. and McKee, B. The Seasons of a Man's Life. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978.

Long, J.S. Productivity and academic position in the scientific career. American Sociological Review, 1978, 43, 889-908.

Reskin, B.F. Academic sponsorship and scientists'; careers. Sociology of Education, 1979, 52, 129-140.

Schubert, W.M. Contributions to AERA annual programs as an indicator of institutional productivity. Educational Researcher, 1979, 8 (7), 13-17.